arXiv:1207.6803v1 [physics.atom-ph] 29 Jul 2012

# On the $\beta^{-}$-decay in the $^{8}$Li and $^{9}$Li atoms

Alexei M. Frolov[*]
*Department of Chemistry*
*University of Western Ontario,*
*London, Ontario N6H 5B7, Canada*

María Belén Ruiz[†]
*Department of Theoretical Chemistry*
*Friederich-Alexander-University Erlangen-Nürnberg,*
*Egerlandstraße 3, 91058 Erlangen, Germany*

(Dated: July 31, 2012)

## Abstract

The nuclear $\beta^{-}$ decay from the ground and some excited states of the three-electron $^{8}$Li and $^{9}$Li atoms is considered. The final state probabilities for the arising Be$^{+}$ ion are determined numerically with the use of highly accurate bound state wave functions of the Li atom and Be$^{+}$ ion. The probability of electron ionization during the nuclear $\beta^{-}$ decay of the Li atom is evaluated numerically. We also discuss a possibility to observe the double $\beta^{-}$ decay by using the known values of the final state probabilities for the regular nuclear $\beta^{-}$ decay.

---

[*] E–mail address: afrolov@uwo.ca

[†] E–mail address: Belen.Ruiz@chemie.uni-erlangen.de

## I. INTRODUCTION

In our earlier study [1] we considered the atomic excitations during the nuclear $\beta^-$-decay in light atoms and ions. Here we want to study the nuclear $\beta^-$-decay in the three-electron Li-atom. The main attention below is given to the $^8$Li and $^9$Li atoms which are of interest in some industrial applications. In general, the $\beta^-$-decay of the Li atom(s) can be written in the following form

$$\text{Li} \rightarrow \text{Be}^+ + e^- + \overline{\nu} \tag{1}$$

where the notation $e^-$ stands for the fast electron emitted during the nuclear $\beta-$decay, while $\overline{\nu}$ designates the electron anti-neutrino. In general, the nuclear $\beta^-$-decay of the Li atom leads to the following re-distribution of the bounded atomic electrons. In the result of such a redistribution of the incident electron density the final Be$^+$ ion can be found in a variety of bound states, or even in a number of unbound states. Briefly, this means the formation of the two-electron Be$^{2+}$ ion during the nuclear $\beta^-$ decay of the Li atom. In actual applications it is important to predict the probabilities to form the final Be$^+$ ion in different final states. Note that there are a few selection rules which are applied to the $\beta^\pm-$decays in atomic systems (see, e.g., [2]). Briefly, these rules can be formulated as the conservation laws for the angular momenta $\mathbf{L}$ and the total electron spin $\mathbf{S}$. In addition to this, the wave functions of the incident and final system must have the same spatial parity. For instance, if the incident Li atom was in its $3^2P(L = 1)-$state, then the final Be$^+$ can be found only in one of its $n^2P(L = 1)$states. In other words, after the nuclear $\beta-$decay of the Li atom in the $3^2P(L = 1)-$state it is impossible to detect the final Be$^+$ ion, e.g., in the $3^2S(L = 0)-$state, or in the $3^2D(L = 2)-$state.

The advantage of considering three-electron atoms and ions is obvious, since the wave functions of such systems can be approximated to very good numerical accuracy. For simplicity, everywhere below in this study we shall assume that the original Li atom was in its ground $^2S(L = 0)-$state. The choice of the ground state of the incident Li-atom is not a fundamental restriction for our method. Formally, such a state can be arbitrary, e.g., either ground state, or 'vibrationally', or 'rotationally' excited atomic state with the given angular momentum $L$ (see below) and the total electron spin $S$.

By analyzing the properties of the known Li-isotopes one finds that there are two $\beta^-$-decaying isotopes of lithium: $^8$Li ($\tau_\beta \approx 0.84$ $sec$) and $^9$Li ($\tau_\beta \approx 0.17$ $sec$). These two isotopes are formed in the $(n;\gamma)-$reactions during thermonuclear explosions in which light thermonuclear fuel ($^{6}$LiD) is compressed to very high densities $\rho \geq 100\ g \cdot sm^{-3}$ by extremely intense flux of soft $X-$ray radiation from the primary. Larger compressions mean, in general, the larger output of these two lithium isotopes. In the laboratory, the $^{8}$Li isotope is produced with the use of the $(n;\gamma)-$reaction at $^{7}$Li. In contrast with this, the $^{9}$Li isotope is produced by using either $(d;2p)-$ and $(n;p)-$reactions with the $^{9}$Be nuclei, or $(t;p)-$reaction with the nuclei of $^{7}$Li.

The life-times of these two lithium isotopes are relatively short from the chemical point of view. Therefore, it is hard to study the regular chemical properties of these isotopes. An alternative approach is based on detail analysis of the optical radiation emitted by the final Be$^{+}$ ions which are formed after the nuclear $\beta^{-}$ decay of these two Li-isotopes. This can be achieved, if we know the correspoding final state probabilities, i.e. the probabilities to form the final Be-ions in certain bound states. The first goal of this study is to evaluate the final state probabilities of formation of various final states in the arising Be$^{+}$ ions. Note that all evaluations of the final state probabilities during the nuclear $\beta^{-}$-decay in atoms and molecules are based on the sudden approximation [3], [4] which applies to both atomic systems (original atom and final ion) involved in the process. The sudden approximation is appropriate for all $\beta^{\pm}-$decaying atoms, since the velocities of the $\beta^{\pm}$ electrons are significantly larger than the velocities of regular atomic electrons.

The final state probabilities, i.e. probabilities to form different atomic states during nuclear $\beta^{-}$-decay in various light atoms, have been evaluated numerically in a number of earlier papers (see, e.g., [1], [2]). All such evaluations, however, have been based on the assumption that the total number of bounded electrons does not change during the nuclear $\beta^{-}-$decay. In reality, the nuclear $\beta$-decay in light atoms often leads to an 'additional' electron ionization. For the Li atom this process can be written in the form

$$\mathrm{Li} \rightarrow \mathrm{Be}^{2+} + e^{-} + \beta^{-} + \overline{\nu} \qquad (2)$$

where $e^{-}$ designates the secondary atomic electron which becomes free during atomic $\beta^{-}$-decay. It is interesting to evaluate the probability of this process and obtain the actual energy spectra of the emitted secondary electrons. Formally, all secondary electrons emitted during atomic $\beta$-decay must be considered as the $\delta-$electrons. On the other hand, the original definition of $\delta-$electrons means that these electrons are fast and their total energies significantly exceed the usual energies of 'regular' atomic electrons. The energy of the free electron from reaction, Eq.(2), is comparable with atomic energies. Therefore, here we deal with the regular atomic ionization during $\beta^-$−decay. In earlier works the process of additional ionization only from the atomic $K$−shell was considered (see discussion and references in [5]).

The main goal of this study is to determine the final state probabilities to form various bound states in the Be$^+$ ion. These calculations are discussed in the fourth Section. Another aim of our study is to evaluate the probability of 'additional' ionization during the nuclear $\beta^-$-decay and investigate the energy spectrum of secondary electrons emitted during the nuclear $\beta^-$-decay. This problem is considered in the third Section. We also briefly investigate the old standing problem of the double nuclear $\beta$−decay. Concluding remarks can be found in the last Section.

## II. EVALUATION OF THE FINAL STATE PROBABILITIES FOR THE BOUND STATES.

As follows from the general theory of perturbations in Quantum Mechanics (see, e.g., [5]) in sudden approximation the final state probabilities are determined as overlap integrals between the wave function of the incident atomic system (i.e. the wave function of the Li atom in our case) and the wave function of the final atomic system (i.e. the wave function of the Be$^+$ ion). To compute such an three-electron integral we need to assume that the total numbers of bound electrons in the incident and final atomic systems are the same. In sudden approximation the general formula for the transition probability $w_{if}$ for the transitions from the incident $i$-state into the final $f$−state takes the form (see, e.g., [5])

$$w_{fi} = \frac{1}{\hbar^2} \mid \int_0^{+\infty} V_{fi} \exp(\imath \omega_{fi} t) dt \mid^2 \approx \frac{1}{\hbar^2} \mid V_{fi} \mid^2 \tag{3}$$

where $V_{fi}$ is the overlap integral computed with the use of time-independent incident and final atomic wave functions, i.e.

$$V_{fi} = \langle \Psi_{\rm Li}(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2, \mathbf{x}_3) \mid \psi_{\rm Be^+}(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2, \mathbf{x}_3) \rangle \tag{4}$$

where $\Psi_{\rm Li}(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2, \mathbf{x}_3)$ and $\psi_{\rm Be^+}(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2, \mathbf{x}_3)$ are the wave functions of the Li-atom and Be$^+$ ion, respectively. The derivation of the formula, Eq.(3), is based on the facts that: (1)

the velocity of the $\beta-$electron is substantially larger than the velocities of atomic electrons, and (2) the final ion does not move during the nuclear $\beta^{\pm}-$decay. In atomic units we have $\hbar = 1, m_e = 1$ and $e = 1$ and, therefore, $w_{if} =\mid V_{fi} \mid^2$. The notation $\mathbf{x}_i$ in Eq.(4) designates the spin-spatial coordinates of the $i-$th electron, i.e. $\mathbf{x}_i = (\mathbf{r}_i, \mathbf{s}_i)$. Note that in some works the integral $V_{fi}$, Eq.(4), (or the ratio $\frac{V_{fi}}{\hbar}$) is called the probability amplitude. The two wave functions in Eq.(4) depend only upon spatial and spin coordinates of three electrons and do not depend upon the time $t$. All wave functions used in Eq.(4) are assumed to be properly symmetrized in respect to all spin-spatial permuations of identical particles (electrons).

As follows from Eq.(4) the final state probability for the $\beta^-$-decay in the $^8$Li and $^9$Li atoms can be determined, if the wave functions of the incident and final atomic systems (bound states) are known. The construction of highly accurate variational wave functions for three-electron atoms and ions is considered in the fourth Section. The final state probabilities determined with the use of such wave functions can be found in Tables I and II. Here we assume that the incident Li atom was in its ground $^2S(L = 0)-$state ($2^2S-$state). It should be mentioned that in reality the incident Li atoms are formed in the $(n;\gamma)-, (n;p)-$ and some other nuclear reactions with neutrons of different energies (see above). In such cases it is hard to expect that all incident Li atoms will always be in the ground $2^2S(L = 0)-$state. In fact, these $\beta^-$-decaying Li atoms can be found in a variety of the rotationally and/or vibrationally excited states. Very likely, after reactions with neutrons the incident Li atom before nuclear $\beta^-$-decay will move with the non-zero speed in some direction. Therefore, some other (excited) bound states in the Li atom must also be considered as the incident atomic states before the nuclear $\beta^-$-decay.

Numerical computation of the overlap integrals, Eq.(4), is reduced to calculations of some separated integrals, which include different spin components of the incident and final atomic wave functions. For instance, let us discuss the construction of three-electron variational wave function of the Li atom. Without loss of generality, below we restrict ourselves to the consideration of the ground $^2S(L = 0)-$state of the Li atom. As is well known (see, e.g., [6], [7]) the accurate variational wave function of the ground (doublet) $^2S(L = 0)-$state of the Li atom is written in the following general form

$$\Psi(\text{Li})_{L=0} = \psi_{L=0}(A; \{r_{ij}\})(\alpha\beta\alpha - \beta\alpha\alpha) + \phi_{L=0}(B; \{r_{ij}\})(2\alpha\alpha\beta - \beta\alpha\alpha - \alpha\beta\alpha) \qquad (5)$$

where $\psi_{L=0}(A; \{r_{ij}\})$ and $\phi_{L=0}(B; \{r_{ij}\})$ are the two independent radial parts (= spatial parts) of the total wave function. Everywhere below in this study, we shall assume that all mentioned wave functions have unit norms. The notations $\alpha$ and $\beta$ in Eq.(5) stand for the one-electron spin-up and spin-down functions, respectively (see, e.g., [8]). The notations $A$ and $B$ in Eq.(5) mean that the two sets of non-linear parameters associated with the radial functions $\psi$ and $\phi$ can be optimized independently. In general, each of the radial basis functions in Eq.(5) explicitly depends upon all six interparticle (or relative) coordinates $r_{12}, r_{13}, r_{23}, r_{14}, r_{24}, r_{34}$, where the indexes 1, 2, 3 stand for the three electrons, while index 4 means the nucleus.

The actual atomic wave function in an atomic system must be completely antisymmetric with respect to all electron spin-spatial variables. For three-electron wave function this requirement is written in the form $\hat{\mathcal{A}}_{123}\Psi(1,2,3) = -\Psi(1,2,3)$, where the wave function $\Psi$ is given by Eq.(5) and $\hat{\mathcal{A}}_e$ is the three-particle (or three-electron) antisymmetrizer $\hat{\mathcal{A}}_e = \hat{e}-\hat{P}_{12}-\hat{P}_{13}-\hat{P}_{23}+\hat{P}_{123}+\hat{P}_{132}$. Here $\hat{e}$ is the identity permutation, while $\hat{P}_{ij}$ is the permutation of the $i$-th and $j$-th particles. Analogously, the operator $\hat{P}_{ijk}$ is the permutation of the $i$-th, $j$-th and $k$-th particles.

Suppose that the incident three-electron wave function of the Li atom has been chosen in the form of Eq.(5). By applying the antisymmetrizer $\hat{\mathcal{A}}_{123}$ to the first part of the total wave function, Eq.(5), one finds

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\mathcal{A}}_{123}\Big[\psi_{L=0}(A;\{r_{ij}\})(\alpha\beta\alpha-\beta\alpha\alpha)\Big] &= (\hat{e}\psi)(\alpha\beta\alpha-\beta\alpha\alpha)+(\hat{P}_{12}\psi)(\alpha\beta\alpha-\beta\alpha\alpha)\\ &-(\hat{P}_{13}\psi)(\alpha\beta\alpha-\alpha\alpha\beta)-(\hat{P}_{23}\psi)(\alpha\alpha\beta-\beta\alpha\alpha)+(\hat{P}_{123}\psi)(\alpha\alpha\beta-\alpha\beta\alpha)\\ &+(\hat{P}_{132}\psi)(\beta\alpha\alpha-\alpha\alpha\beta) \qquad (6)\end{aligned}$$

where the notations $(\hat{P}_{ij}\psi)$ and $(\hat{P}_{ijk}\psi)$ mean the permutation operators which act on the coordinate functions only. Analogously, for the second part of the total wave function one finds

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\mathcal{A}}_{123}\Big[\phi_{L=0}(B;\{r_{ij}\})(2\alpha\alpha\beta-\beta\alpha\alpha-\alpha\beta\alpha)\Big] &= (\hat{e}\phi)(2\alpha\alpha\beta-\beta\alpha\alpha-\alpha\beta\alpha)\\ &-(\hat{P}_{12}\phi)(2\alpha\alpha\beta-\beta\alpha\alpha-\alpha\beta\alpha)-(\hat{P}_{13}\phi)(2\beta\alpha\alpha-\alpha\alpha\beta-\alpha\beta\alpha)\\ &-(\hat{P}_{23}\phi)(2\alpha\beta\alpha-\alpha\alpha\beta-\beta\alpha\alpha)+(\hat{P}_{123}\phi)(2\beta\alpha\alpha-\alpha\beta\alpha-\alpha\alpha\beta)\\ &+(\hat{P}_{132}\phi)(2\alpha\beta\alpha-\alpha\alpha\beta-\beta\alpha\alpha) \qquad (7)\end{aligned}$$

where the notations $(\hat{P}_{ij}\phi)$ and $(\hat{P}_{ijk}\phi)$ mean the permutations of the spatial coordinates in the $\phi_{L=0}(B;\{r_{ij}\})$ radial function, Eq.(5).

Now, by using the expressions, Eqs.(6) and (7), we can obtain the formulas which can be used in computations of the final state probabilities in the case of the nuclear $\beta^-$-decay, Eq.(1), in the three-electron Li atom. For instance, if the final wave function has the same spin-symmetry, i.e. it is written in the form

$$\Psi_{fi} = \psi_{fi}(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2, \mathbf{r}_3)(\alpha\beta\alpha - \beta\alpha\alpha) + \phi_{fi}(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2, \mathbf{r}_3)(2\alpha\alpha\beta - \beta\alpha\alpha - \alpha\beta\alpha) \tag{8}$$

then the final state probabilities are determined with the use of the following formulas

$$P_{\psi\psi} = \langle\psi_{fi}(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2, \mathbf{r}_3) \mid \frac{1}{2\sqrt{3}}\Bigl(2\hat{e} + 2\hat{P}_{12} - \hat{P}_{13} - \hat{P}_{23} - \hat{P}_{123} - \hat{P}_{132}\Bigr)\psi_{\rm Li}(A; \{r_{ij}\})\rangle \tag{9}$$

$$P_{\phi\psi} = \langle\phi_{fi}(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2, \mathbf{r}_3) \mid \frac{1}{2}\Bigl(\hat{P}_{13} - \hat{P}_{23} + \hat{P}_{123} - \hat{P}_{132}\Bigr)\psi_{\rm Li}(A; \{r_{ij}\})\rangle \tag{10}$$

$$P_{\psi\phi} = \langle\psi_{fi}(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2, \mathbf{r}_3) \mid \frac{1}{2}\Bigl(\hat{P}_{13} - \hat{P}_{23} + \hat{P}_{123} - \hat{P}_{132}\Bigr)\phi_{\rm Li}(B; \{r_{ij}\})\rangle \tag{11}$$

$$P_{\phi\phi} = \langle\phi_{fi}(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2, \mathbf{r}_3) \mid \frac{1}{2\sqrt{3}}\Bigl(2\hat{e} - 2\hat{P}_{12} + \hat{P}_{13} + \hat{P}_{23} - \hat{P}_{123} - \hat{P}_{132}\Bigr)\phi_{\rm Li}(B; \{r_{ij}\})\rangle \tag{12}$$

Note that these formulas coincides with the known formulas [9] which correspond to the doublet → doublet transition in the three-electron atomic systems. Briefly, this means that the both incident and final atomic states contain three-electrons in the doublet spin configuration (the total electron spin equals $\frac{1}{2}$). This case corresponds to the 'classical' $\beta^{\pm}$-decay in few-electron atoms, when the incident and final electron configurations has the same $L$ and $S$ quantum numbers.

In reality, another process is also possible in few-electron atoms during the nuclear $\beta^{\pm}$-decay in few- and many-electron atoms. This process leads to the formation of the final ion/atom in some excited states. For instance, consider the case when the three final electrons form the doublet configuration with the spin function $\alpha\alpha\beta$. It is clear that such a wave function cannot represent the ground state of the Be$^+$ ion. However, some excited states (with vacancies in the internal electron shells) can have this spin function, e.g., $1s2s3p-$, $1s2s4d-$ and $1s3s3p$-states of the Be$^+$ ion. Another example is discussed in the next Section. It represents an additional electron ionization during the nuclear $\beta^-$ decay in three-electron atom. If this free electron moves away in the $\beta-$spin state, then the final Be$^{2+}$ ion can be only in its triplet spin state (not singlet state). Formally this means formation of the final ion in an excited state (with some vacancies on its internal electron shells). In this case the formulas for the final state probabilities take the form

$$P_{tr\psi} = \langle\psi_{fi}(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2, \mathbf{r}_3) \mid \frac{1}{2\sqrt{3}}\Bigl(\hat{P}_{13} - \hat{P}_{23} + \hat{P}_{123} - \hat{P}_{132}\Bigr)\psi_{\rm Li}(A; \{r_{ij}\})\rangle \tag{13}$$

$$P_{tr\phi} = \langle \psi_{fi}(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2, \mathbf{r}_3) \mid \frac{1}{2\sqrt{3}} \Bigl(2\hat{e} - 2\hat{P}_{12} + \hat{P}_{13} + \hat{P}_{23} - \hat{P}_{123} - \hat{P}_{132}\Bigr) \phi_{\rm Li}(B; \{r_{ij}\}) \rangle \qquad (14)$$

where it is assumed that the incident electron wave function was written in the form of Eq.(5). These formulas indicate clearly that the probabilities to find the final $\text{Be}^{2+}$ ion in the excited triplet spin states are not zero. In all earlier studies the transitions to the final atomic states with different spin states were ignored. Moreover, any possibility to form the final few-electron ion/atom in excited states (with some vacancies on internal electron shells) during the nuclear $\beta^{\pm}$-decay was rejected. The actual existence of such transitions is a great achievement of this study.

In general, during the nuclear $\beta^{-}$-decay of the Li atom the final $\text{Be}^{+}$ ion can be formed in many different bound and/or unbound states. If such a state is unbound, then we deal with the additional ionization during atomic $\beta^{-}$ decay. It is discussed in the next Section. This process is of great interest, since it often leads to the formation of the final ion in an excited state(s) with various vacancies in the internal electron shells. For light atoms and ions this means a possibility to observe emission of the optical quanta after the nuclear $\beta^{\pm}-$decay in many-electron atoms with the total number of electrons $\geq 3$.

## III. ADDITIONAL IONIZATION DURING $\beta^{-}$-DECAY.

The probability of ionization (or 'additional' ionization) of the final $\text{Be}^{+}$ ion during the nuclear $\beta-$decay can also be evaluated with the use of the sudden approximation. In this case the final wave function is constructed as the product of the bound state wave function of the two-electron $\text{Be}^{2+}$ ion and the wave function of the unbound electron which moves in the central Coulomb field of this two-electron ion. To determine the corresponding final state probability one needs to compute the following overlap integral between the wave functions of the incident and final atomic systems

$$\mathcal{A}_{fi} = \langle \Psi_{\rm Li}(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2, \mathbf{x}_3) \mid \psi_{\rm Be^{+}}(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2) \phi(\mathbf{x}_3) \rangle \qquad (15)$$

where $\phi(\mathbf{x}_3)$ is the wave function of the unbound electron which moves in the Coulomb field of the $\text{Be}^{2+}$ ion. This function must include the continuous parameter $k$ which is the electron's wave number (see below). It should be mentioned that such an 'additional' ionization has nothing to do with the interaction between the emitted $\beta^{-}$ electron and atomic electron. In fact, the additional ionization is directly related with the presence of the non-zero component $\simeq \phi(\mathbf{x}_3)$ in the incident atomic wave function.

The probability of additional ionization has been determined for a number of $\beta^-$−decaying atoms in a number of earlier studies (see, e.g., [4] and [5]). These works, however, were restricted to the analysis of the electron ionization from the internal $K$−shells only. In this case the original problem was reduced to the solution of the model one-electron problem. Analogous reduction for few-electron atomic systems is much more difficult to perform, since all electron-nucleus and electron-electron coordinates are not truly independent. It complicates accurate computation of integrals which involve such coordinates. Nevertheless, numerical computations of the final state probabilities can be conducted even with the use of highly accurate wave functions known for many few-electron atoms. In this Section we discuss some details of such calculations.

In atomic units the explicit form of the one-electron wave function is $\phi(\mathbf{r}) = \phi_{kl}(r) Y_{lm}(\mathbf{n})$, where $\phi_{kl}(r)$ is the one-electron radial function, while $Y_{lm}(\mathbf{n})$ is the corresponding spherical harmonics and $\mathbf{n} = \frac{\mathbf{r}}{r}$ is the unit vector accosiated with $\mathbf{r}$. In this Section the parameter $k$ is $k = \sqrt{\frac{2m_e E}{\hbar^2}} = \sqrt{2E}$ (in atomic units). The explicit formula for the radial function $\phi_{kl}(r)$ (in atomic units) is (see, e.g., [5])

$$\phi_{kl}(r) = \frac{C_{kl}}{(2l+1)!} (2Qkr)^l \cdot \exp(-\imath Qkr) \cdot {}_1F_1\Bigl(\frac{\imath}{Qk} + l + 1, 2l+2, 2\imath Qkr\Bigr) \qquad (16)$$

where ${}_1F_1(a, b; x)$ is the confluent hypergeometric function (see, e.g., [11]), while $C_{kl}$ is the following constant

$$C_{kl} = \Bigl[\frac{8\pi Qk}{1 - \exp(-\frac{2\pi}{Qk})}\Bigr]^{\frac{1}{2}} \cdot \prod_{s=1}^{l} \sqrt{s^2 + \frac{1}{Q^2 k^2}} \qquad (17)$$

In these two equations the parameter $Q$ is the electric charge of the remaining double-charged (positive) ion, i.e. $Q = 2$. In reality, this parameter must slightly be varied (around 2) to obtain better agreement with the experimental data. Such variations formally represent ionizations from different electronic shells of the incident Li atom.

Accurate numerical computations of the final state probabilities during the nuclear $\beta^-$ decay in few-electron atoms with additional electron ionization are very difficult to perform, since all highly accurate wave functions of the bound states explicitly include the electron-electron coordinates. As a rule, the better accuracy of the bound state wave function means more complete and accurate involvement of the terms which describe various electron-electron correlations. On the other hand, the crucial step of the whole procedure is the numerical and/or analytical computations of the Fourier transformation of the one-electron wave function. This corresponds to the free motion of the final electron. During that step of the procedure (Fourier transform) it is better to consider all electrons as particles independent of each other, i.e. ignore all electron-electron correlations. In the general case, this two-fold problem has no simple solution which is accurate and relatively simple for Fourier transform at the same time.

In this study we have developed an approximate procedure which can be used to perform approximate numerical evaluations for the $\beta^-$-decaying isotopes of the three-electron atoms. In this approach the trial wave function is constructed as the sum of many terms and each of these terms contains the products of the electron-nucleus functions. None of the three electron-electron coordinates $r_{32}, r_{31}, r_{21}$ is included in such trial wave functions. For the ground state (the doublet ${}^2S(L = 0)-$state) of the Li atom the radial wave function $\psi_{L=0}(A; \{r_{ij}\})$ is chosen in the following form:

$$\begin{aligned}\psi_{L=0}(r_{14}, r_{24}, r_{34}, 0, 0, 0) &= \sum_{k=1}^{N_s} C_k r_{14}^{m_1(k)} r_{24}^{m_2(k)} r_{34}^{m_3(k)} exp(-\alpha_k r_{14} - \beta_k r_{24} - \gamma_k r_{34}) \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^{N_s} C_k r_1^{m_1(k)} r_2^{m_2(k)} r_3^{m_3(k)} exp(-\alpha_k r_1 - \beta_k r_2 - \gamma_k r_3)\end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

where $C_k$ are the linear (or variational) coefficients, while $m_1(k), m_2(k)$ and $m_3(k)$ are the three integer (non-negative) parameters, which are, in fact, the powers of the three electron-nucleus coordinates $r_{i4} = r_i$ $(i = 1,\ 2,\ 3)$. Below, we shall assume that the trial wave function Eq.(18) has a unit norm. Furthermore, in all calculations performed for this study only one spin function $\chi_1(\chi_1 = \alpha\beta\alpha - \beta\alpha\alpha)$ is used. It is clear that the wave function Eq.(18) contains only electron-nuclear coordinates and does not include any of the electron-electron coordinates. The real (and non-negative) parameters $\alpha_k, \beta_k, \gamma_k$ are the $3N_s$ varied parameters of the variational expansion, Eq.(18). The wave function, Eq.(18), must be properly symmetrized upon all three electron coordinates.

The principal question for the wave function, Eq.(18), is related to its overall accuracy. If (and only if) such an accuracy is relatively high, then the trial wave function, Eq.(18), can be used in actual computations of the probability amplitudes. For this study we have constructed the 23-term variational wave function shown in Table I of Ref.[10]. This wave function is represented in the form of Eq.(18) and contains no electron-electron coordinates. All sixty nine ($69 = 3 \times 23$) non-linear parameters in this trial wave function have been optimized carefully in a series of bound state computations performed for the ground $^2S(L = 0)-$state of the Li atom. Finally, the total energy $E$ of the ground $^2S-$state of the $^{\infty}$Li atom obtained with this independent-electron wave function is -7.44859276608 $a.u.$ Note that such an energy $E$ is close to the exact total energy of the ground state of the $^{\infty}$Li atom. It indicates a good overall quality of our approximate wave function with 23 terms which does not include any of the electron-electron coordinates $r_{12}, r_{13}, r_{23}$. This wave function is used in computations of the final state probabilities (see below) for the nuclear $\beta^-$ decay with additional electron ionization in the three-electron Li atom.

Note also that in atomic physics based on the Hatree-Fock and even hydrogenic approximations the ground state in the Li atom is designated as the $2^2S-$state, while in the classification scheme developed in highly accurate computations the same state is often designated as the $1^2S-$state. This classification scheme is very convenient to work with trully correlated few-electron wave functions. It is clear that no hydrogenic quantum numbers are good in such cases, and we have to use the more appropriate (and convenient) classification scheme. To avoid confllicts between these two classification schemes in this study we follow the system of notation used earlier by Larsson [7] which designated this state in the Li atom as the 'ground $^2S$-state'.

The wave function of the final two-electron Be$^{2+}$ ion arising during the nuclear $\beta^-$-decay with the additional ionization can also be approximated with the use of basis functions which depend upon the electron-nuclear coordinates only and do not include the electron-electron coordinate $r_{21}$. For the bound $S(L = 0)-$states of the Be$^{2+}$ ion such an expansion takes the form

$$\psi_{L=0}(r_1, r_2, 0) = \sum_{k=1}^{N_s} C_k r_1^{m_1(k)} r_2^{m_2(k)} exp(-\alpha_k r_1 - \beta_k r_2) \qquad (19)$$

The use of the approximate wave functions Eqs.(18) - (19) which do not depend upon explicitly the electron-electron coordinates simplify numerical computations of all integrals required for the numerical evaluation of the final state probabilities during the nuclear $\beta^-$-decay in the three-electron atoms and ions. The remaining part of the problem is the analytical computation of the integral between the product of the factor $r^m \exp(-\gamma r)$ and radial function from Eq.(16). Such an integral is computed with the use of the formula (see, e.g., Eq.(7.522.8) from [11]):

$$\int_0^{+\infty} \exp(-\lambda x) x^{\nu} {}_1F_1(a, b; cx) dx = \frac{\Gamma(\nu + 1)}{\lambda^{\nu} + 1} {}_2F_1(a, \nu + 1; b; \frac{c}{\lambda}) \qquad (20)$$

where $\Gamma(x)$ is the usual $\gamma-$function (see, e.g., Section 8.31 in [11]). Our results of numerical computations of the final states probabilities for the nuclear $\beta^-$-decay with additional electron ionization will be published elsewhere.

## IV. BOUND STATE WAVE FUNCTIONS OF THE THREE-ELECTRON ATOMS AND IONS

As is shown above to determine the final state probabilities during the nuclear $\beta^-$-decay one needs to know the accurate wave functions of the incident and final atoms and ions. In sudden approximation the angular momentum $L$, electron spin $S$ and spatial parity $\pi$ of the atomic wave function $\Psi$ are conserved during the nuclear $\beta^-$-decay. Therefore, all approximate wave functions must be constructed as the eigenfunctions of the operators of angular momentum $\hat{L}^2$ and total electron spin $\hat{S}^2$. In this study we use the variational wave functions constructed with the help of the method of Hylleraas-Configuration Interaction (Hy-CI). In general, the wave functions of Hylleraas-type expansion rapidly converge to the exact wave functions. The Hylleraas-Configuration Interaction wave function [12, 13] is a linear combination of symmetry adapted configurations $\Phi_p$:

$$\Psi_{\rm Hy-CI} = \sum_{p=1}^{N} C_p \Phi_p, \quad \Phi_p = \hat{O}(\hat{L}^2)\hat{\mathcal{A}}\psi_p\chi \tag{21}$$

where the spatial part of the basis functions are Hartree products of Slater orbitals containing up to one interelectronic distance $r_{ij}$ per configuration:

$$\psi_p = r_{ij}^{\nu} \prod_{k=1}^{n} \phi_k(r_k, \theta_k, \varphi_k). \tag{22}$$

If $\nu = 1$, then the wave function, Eq.(21), corresponds to Hy-CI. In the case when $\nu = 0$, it is the usual Configuration Interaction (CI) wave function. The higher powers of the electron-electron distances $r_{ij}^{\nu}$ can effectively be reduced to the $r_{ij}$ term (or $\nu = 1$). Indeed, all higher terms $\nu > 1$ can be expressed as a product of $r_{ij}$, a polynomial of $r_i, r_j$ and some angular functions. Also, in Eq.(21) $N$ is the number of configurations used in computations. The coefficients $C_p$ are determined variationally. The operator $\hat{O}(\hat{L}^2)$ in Eq.(21) projects over the appropriate space, so that every configuration is an eigenfunction of the square of the angular momentum operator $\hat{L}^2$. $\hat{\mathcal{A}}$ is the antisymmetrization operator upon all electron spin-spatial coordinates and $\chi$ is the electron-spin eigenfunction. For the lithium atom and three-electron ions one can choose the total spin function in the one-component form, i.e. $\chi = (\alpha\beta - \beta\alpha)\alpha$.

The basis functions $\phi_k$ in this work are the *s*-, *p*-, *d*-, and *f*-Slater orbitals. Since the convergence of Hy-CI wave functions is usually very fast, there is no need to use orbitals with higher angular momentum. The unnormalized complex Slater orbitals are defined as:

$$\phi(\mathbf{r}) = r^{n-1} e^{-\alpha r} Y_l^m(\theta, \varphi). \tag{23}$$

where the parameter $\alpha$ is the adjustable variable (for each orbital) and $Y_l^m(\theta, \varphi)$ are the complex spherical harmonics. The basis sets employed in this work are $n = 4$, 5, 6 and 7, where the basis $n = 4$ (for short $n4$) means the orbital set $[1s2s3s4s2p3p4p3d4d4f]$). With all these orbitals from our basis set we have constructed the most important configurations of the $S(L = 0, M = 0)$-, $P(L = 1, M = 0)$-, and $D(L = 2, M = 0)$-symmetries. All details of construction of the symmetry adapted configurations $\Phi_p$ of Eq.(21) can be found in Ref.[14].

The orbital exponents have been optimized for each atomic state of the Li atom and $\text{Be}^+$ ion. A set of two exponents have been used, one for the K-shell and the other for the odd-electron of the L-shell. It was kept equal for all configurations. This technique accelerates numerical computations. The obtained results are sufficiently accurate for the purposes of our investigation. It is clear that to obtain highly accurate energies one needs to apply more flexibility in the exponents. It was shown in recent calculations on the lithium atom [6, 15–17]. The virial factor $\chi = -\frac{\langle V \rangle}{\langle T \rangle}$ is used to check the quality of the wave function and guide the numerical optimization of the exponents in the trial wave functions.

As for a given basis set the number of possible configurations would be too large, we have selected the 'most important' configurations according to their contribution to the total energy. In our case the selection criteria is an energy contribution $> 10^{-8}$ a.u. with respect to the previous configuration. For that, blocks containing all possible Hy-CI configurations of the same type have been filtered and the configurations with less energetic weight have been thrown out. More details can be found in [14]. Note that the length of the wave functions varies then for every state, and the selected configurations are for every state different. As a result, higher excited states must be approximated with the use of the longer trial functions.

For our calculations in this study we have written a three-electron Hy-CI computer program in Fortran 90 language. The calculations have been done with the use of the quadruple precision. The program has been thoroughly checked by comparing results of our numerical calculations with the analogous results obtained earlier by Sims and Hagstrom [15] and King [16] for the lithium atom. Note that in such calculations we have observed a complete agreement. The energy calculations of the ground and excited S-states of the both Li atom and $\mathrm{Be}^+$ ion are shown in Table I, together with their convergency with respect to the basis set used. For the ground states of the Li atom and $\mathrm{Be}^+$ ion an accuracy of (1.4 - 1.9)$\cdot 10^{-6}$ *a.u.* has been achieved with the techniques described in this paper. For the first two excited states of both Li atom and $\mathrm{Be}^+$ ion the accuracy is of about $5 \cdot 10^{-6}$ *a.u.*. In the third and higher excited states within a given symmetry of the S-,P- and D-states the accuracy is of the order of $\pm 1 \cdot 10^{-3}$ *a.u.*. For the accurate calculation of these higher excited states it would be necessary to introduce different sets of orbital exponents and to increase the orbital basis. However, numerical calculations on higher excited states are sparse in the literature.

For numerical calculations of the amplitudes and transition probabilities during nuclear $\beta^-$-decays in three-electron atomic systems we have developed the new computer program which calculates the overlap integrals, Eq.(4), between the wave functions of Li atom and $\mathrm{Be}^+$ ion. The previous step is the calculation of the wave functions of the different states of the Li and $\mathrm{Be}^+$ atoms using the Hy-CI method. The algorithms we have employed for the calculation of the kinetic and potential energy integrals can be found in Refs. [18–20]. The energy values obtained for the ground and S-, P- and D-excited states are given in Ref. [14], as so as more details on the calculation and the comparison with the best data of the bibliography. For contrary in the calculation of the overlaps we need only the overlap-integrals between the configurations, and the coefficients of the Hy-CI wave functions. Therefore in this program only integrals of the types $\langle r_{12}^n \rangle$, $\langle r_{12} r_{13} \rangle$ are needed, while the fully-linked three-electron integral $\left\langle \frac{r_{12} r_{13}}{r_{23}} \right\rangle$ is not needed, when the overlap between the wave functions containing the $r_{ij}$ terms is calculated.

In this work we have improved our earlier method of calculations of the final state probabilities during the nuclear $\beta^-$-decay [1]. Now, we calculate the overlap between the wave functions of different lenghts. This overlap is the sum of the matrix elements of a rectangular overlap matrix. This method of calculation has an advantage, since there are several possible checks. First, the permutation symmetry of the overlap matrix $\langle \Psi_1 | \Psi_2 \rangle = \langle \Psi_2 \mid \Psi_1 \rangle$ and its unit-norm condition, i.e. $\langle \Psi_1 \mid \Psi_1 \rangle = \langle \Psi_2 \mid \Psi_2 \rangle = 1$.

The convergence of the probability amplitudes and probabilities increases with the improvement of the total energies of the incident and final atomic systems. The final transition probabilities are calculated with an error $\leq 0.01\%$ (they are summarized in Table II). We have obtained the transition probability from the ground $^2S-$state of the Li atom to the ground state of the Be$^+$ ion $\approx 57.71\%$ . The transition probability for the transition from the ground $^2S-$state of the Li atom to the first excited $^2S-$state of Be$^+$ ion is $\approx 26.51$ % and to the second excited $^2S-$state such a probability is $\approx 0.55\%$ . The sum of the probabilities is then $\approx 84.99\%$ and the probability of ionization calculated as 1.0 minus this sum is $\approx 15.00\%$ .

In addition we have computed the transition probabilities from the lower-lying excited states of S-, P-, and D- symmetry of the Li atom to the states of the same symmetry states in the Be$^+$ ion. The results can be found in Tables III, IV and VI, respectively. It is clear that the sum of the probabilities of transition from on state of the incident atom to the states of the final one must always be less (or equal) unity. In this work we have checked this condition everywhere. For instance, the transition probability $2^2S$ (Li) $\rightarrow$ $3^2S$ (Be$^+$) is $\approx 56.93$ %, while the probability of transition $3^2S$ (Li) $\rightarrow$ $4^2S$ (Be$^+$) is $\approx 62.46\%$ . It is interesting to note that the probabilities of transition from the incident atom in excited and rotationaly excited states are relatively large, showing the possibility of these processes, for example the D-transitions $1^2D$(Li) $\rightarrow 1^2D$(Be$^+$) $\approx 37.73\%$ and $1^2D$(Li) $\rightarrow 2^2D$(Be$^+$) $\approx 44.69\%$. This indicates, clear that from each state in the $\beta^-$$-$decaying atom there only are a few final (partner) states. The probability of ionization (or more properly that the final electronic state is a $6^1S$, $6^1P$ or $6^1D$ or higher) is also calculated.

Finally, from the methodogical point of view, it is interesting to compare the results obtained by using Hy-type wave functions and CI wave functions. Traditionally, in the literature on the nuclear $\beta^-$-decay calculations in atoms it has been generally assumed that Hy-type wave functions are needed, but a real proof of this cannot be found anywhere. Therefore in this work we want to prove that fact. In Table VI we show the same calculations obtained with accurate CI L-S wave functions using Slater orbitals. The probabilities have a poor convergency compared with the ones obtained by Hy-type wave functions. This means when improving the accuracy of the energy the calculated amplitude does not converge. We have investigated this problem by using the double and quadruple precision, showing that there is no loss of precision in the coefficients of the wave functions, but the loss of precision is in the trial wave functions themselves. The reason is that the $\beta$-decay is a nuclear phenomena where the change of charge in the nucleus plays an importan role. The different performance of Hy-CI and CI wave functions is due to their methodological differences in the description of the electronic density near of the nucleus.

In recent calculations of the transition probabilities for the nuclear $\beta^-$-decay of the helium atom into the $Li^+$ ion (He → $Li^+$), Wauters and Vaeck [21] by using the basis set of B-splines obtained the total energies of the incident He atom and final $Li^+$ ion which were very close to the energies obtained by the Hylleraas wave functions. This is due to the fact that this basis set are designed to describe the real shape of the orbitals. However, this is not a standard CI method. In general, the transition probabilities during the nuclear $\beta^{\pm}$-decay calculated with the CI method are not very accurate. Higher accurate wave functions which describe correctly the nuclear-electron cusp and therefore the electron density near of the nucleus are needed to calculate precise transition probabilities during various nuclear processes.

## V. ON THE DOUBLE $\beta$ DECAY.

The idea of the double nuclear $\beta^{\pm}-$decay in some nuclei was proposed in the middle of 1950's by A.B. Migdal and others. Such an assumption was based on observation of the nuclear products formed during large-scale thermonuclear explosions. Extremely high compressions of the light thermonuclear fuel (mainly $^6$LiD) and very intense neutron fluxes generated in these explosions, produce a significant amount of neutron-excessive isotopes of the heavy transuranium elements. The overall intensity of $\beta-$decays observed in a few first seconds after large thermonuclear explosions is very high. However, already after 10 - 15 seconds the remains of thermonuclear explosive device contain only regular 'slowly'-decaying $\beta^-$-isotopes of usual heavy elements. The following intensity of the nuclear $\beta^-$-decay from the products of thermonuclear explosion decreases with time as $\simeq t^{-1.37}$ [22]. Approximate balance between the total number of nuclei of $\beta^-$-decaying isotopes which are formed and destroyed during large thermonuclear explosions leads to a conclusion that the double $\beta^-$-decay is possible. Originally, the double $\beta^-$−decay of neutron-excessive nuclei was proposed to explain very high intensities of the nuclear $\beta-$transformations in a first moments after large thermonuclear explosions. Formally, there is no restriction (or selection rule) which can prohibit the double $\beta^-$-decay in atomic nuclei. However, since the middle of 1950's all experimental attempts to detect the double nuclear $\beta^{-}-$decay have failed.

In this study we do not want to discuss neither theoretical significance of the double $\beta^{-}$-decay for nuclear physics (or for the finite Fermi systems), nor its possible applications. Instead, let us consider the difference in the final atomic probabilities which can be obtained in the two following cases: (a) the double nuclear $\beta-$decay, and (b) two consecutive (single) nuclear $\beta^{-}-$decays. From atomic point of view we need to compare the time $\tau_{2\beta}$ for which two $\beta^{-}$ particles leave the nucleus with the regular atomic time $\tau_e = \frac{\hbar^2}{m_e e^4 Q^2}$, where $Q$ is the electric charge of the nucleus expressed in $e$, i.e. $Q = Qe$. The condition $\tau_{2\beta} \ll \tau_e$ means sudden emission of the two fast $\beta^{-}$ particles. In this case the probability amplitude is determined as the ovelap integral of the incident and final (atomic) wave functions, Eq.(4). If the equation of the double $\beta^{-}$ decay is written in the form $X \rightarrow Z^{2+} + \beta_1^{-} + \beta_2^{-} + \overline{\nu}_1 + \overline{\nu}_2$, then for the final state probability one finds (in atomic units)

$$w_{fi} =\mid \langle \Psi_{\rm X}({\bf x}_1, {\bf x}_2, \ldots, {\bf x}_n) \mid \psi_{{\rm Z}^{2+}}({\bf x}_1, {\bf x}_2, \ldots, {\bf x}_n) \rangle \mid^2 \qquad (24)$$

In the opposite case, i.e., when $\tau_{2\beta} \gg \tau_e$, we deal with the two consequent nuclear $\beta^{-}$ decays. In this case we need to use the sudden approximation twice. The corresponding consequtive equations are $X \rightarrow Y^{+} + \beta_1^{-} + \overline{\nu}_1$ and $Y^{+} \rightarrow Z^{2+} + \beta_2^{-} + \overline{\nu}_2$. The amplitude of the final state probability takes the form

$$A_{fi} = \langle \Psi_{\rm X}({\bf x}_1, {\bf x}_2, \ldots, {\bf x}_n) \mid \psi_{{\rm Y}^{+}}({\bf x}_1, {\bf x}_2, \ldots, {\bf x}_n) \rangle \langle \Psi_{{\rm Y}^{+}}({\bf x}_1, {\bf x}_2, \ldots, {\bf x}_n) \mid \psi_{{\rm Z}^{2+}}({\bf x}_1, {\bf x}_2, \ldots, {\bf x}_n) \rangle \qquad (25)$$

and the final state probability is $w_{fi} =\mid A_{fi} \mid^2$. The sum over all states of the $Y^{+}$ ion will lead us back to Eq.(24). However, if $\tau_{2\beta} \gg \tau_e$, then the final state of the Y$^{+}$ ion is uniformly defined and Eq.(25) can be used in this case only for this unique state of the Y$^{+}$ ion. The sum over all 'intermediate' states of the $Y^{+}$ ion is reduced to the one term only. From here one easily finds that

$$w_{fi}({\rm X} \rightarrow {\rm Z}^{2+}) \ge w_{fi}({\rm X} \rightarrow {\rm Y}^{+}) w_{fi}({\rm Y}^{+} \rightarrow {\rm Z}^{2+}) \qquad (26)$$

In general, the study of the double nuclear $\beta^{-}$-decay in atoms and molecules can be used as a natural tool to study electron-nucleus and electron-electron correlations at the femto- and attosecond time-scale. Unfortunately, at this moment nobody performs similar research even for atoms and ions.

## VI. CONCLUSION

We have considered the nuclear $\beta^-$-decays in the three-electron $^8$Li and $^9$Li atoms. The final state probabilities to form different bound states in the Be$^+$ ion have been determined to very good accuracy.

The Hylleraas-CI wave functions constructed for atoms/ions involved in the $\beta^-$-decay are substantially more accurate than CI wave functions used in earlier studies. The reason is they provide a better description of the electron density near of the nucleus. For the first time, the wave functions of the excited states are determined to the same numerical accuracy than the wave functions of the ground states. By using such wave functions we could determine the final state probabilities to very high accuracy.

We also discuss a possibility to observe the double nuclear $\beta^-$−decay and nuclear $\beta^-$−decay with the additional ionization. It is shown that the Be$^{2+}$ ion formed during the last process can be detected not only in the singlet bound states, but also in the triplet bound states. It was never observed/predicted in earlier studies on the $\beta^-$−decays in atoms. Briefly, we can say that the nuclear $\beta^-$−decay with the additional ionization in few-electron atoms may lead to the fundamental re-structuring of the internal electron shells of the incident atom.

---

[1] A.M. Frolov and M.B. Ruiz, Phys. Rev. A **82**, 042511 (2010).

[2] A.M. Frolov and J.D. Talman, Phys. Rev. A **72**, 022511 (2005).

[3] A.B. Migdal, J. Phys. (USSR) **4**, 449 (1941).

[4] A.B. Migdal and V. Krainov, *Approximation Methods in Quantum Mechanics.*, (W.A. Benjamin, New York (1969)).

[5] L.D. Landau and E.M. Lifshitz, *Quantum Mechanics: non-relativistic theory.*, (3rd. ed. Pergamon Press, New York (1976)), Chpt. VI.

[6] A.M. Frolov, Eur. Phys. J. D **61**, 571 (2011).

[7] S. Larsson, Phys. Rev. 169, 49 (1968).

[8] P.A.M. Dirac, *The Principles of Quantum Mechanics.*, (4th ed.,Oxford at the Clarendon Press, Oxford (1958)).

[9] A.M. Frolov and D.M. Wardlaw, JETP **138**, 5 (2010).

[10] A.M. Frolov, *On the nuclear* $(n;t)-$*reaction in the three-electron Li atom*, ArXiv: 1207.3471 [phys.,at.-phys.] (2012).

[11] I.S. Gradstein and I.M. Ryzhik, *Tables of Integrals, Series and Products*, (6th revised ed., Academic Press, New York, (2000)).

[12] J.S. Sims and S.A. Hagstrom, J. Chem. Phys. **55**, 4699 (1971).

[13] J.S. Sims and S.A. Hagstrom, Phys. Rev. A **4**, 908 (1971).

[14] J. Margraf and M.B. Ruiz, *Hylleraas-CI calculations on the S-, P-, and D-excited states of the Li atom and* $Be^+$ *ion*, submitted (2012).

[15] J.S. Sims and S.A. Hagstrom, Phys. Rev. A **80**, 052507 (2009).

[16] F.W. King, Adv. At. Mol. Opt. Phys. **40**, 57 (1999)

[17] A.J. Takkar, T. Koga, T. Tanabe, and H. Teruya, Chem. Phys. Lett. **366**, 95 (2002).

[18] M.B. Ruiz, J. Math. Chem. **49**, 2457 (2011).

[19] M.B. Ruiz, J. Math. Chem. **46**, 24 (2009).

[20] J.S. Sims and S.A. Hagstrom, J. Phys. B: At. Mol. Opt. Phys. **37**, 1519 (2004).

[21] L. Wauters and N. Vaeck, Phys. Rev. C **53**, 497 (1996).

[22] P.A. Yampolskii, *Neutrons of Atomic Explosions*, (Energoatomizdat, Moscow, (1961)) [in Russian].

TABLE I: Convergency of the Hy-CI calculations of the transition probabilities of $\beta^-$-decay of the lithium atom with respect the basis set employed. Energy in a.u.

| State | Basis[a] | N[b] | Amplitude | Probability | Virial | Energy | Ref. Ener.[c] | Diff. in $\mu$h |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Li $1^2$S | n4 | 308 | | | 2.000004 | -7.4780 5322 25 | | 7.1 |
| Li $1^2$S | n5 | 517 | | | 2.000001 | -7.4780 5782 50 | | 2.5 |
| Li $1^2$S | n6 | 620 | | | 2.000000 | -7.4780 5889 25 | -7.4780 6032 39 | 1.4 |
| Be$^+$ $1^2$S | n4 | 308 | 0.7596 8128 09 | 0.5771 157 | 2.000002 | -14.3247 5737 75 | | |
| Be$^+$ $1^2$S | n5 | 612 | 0.7596 8642 44 | 0.5771 234 | 2.000001 | -14.3247 6041 19 | | 2.8 |
| Be$^+$ $1^2$S | n6 | 707 | 0.7596 8900 66 | 0.5771 273 | 2.000000 | -14.3247 6139 60 | -14.3247 6317 68 | 1.8 |
| Be$^+$ $2^2$S | n4 | 307 | 0.5149 4787 82 | 0.2651 713 | 2.000000 | -13.9227 5998 01 | | |
| Be$^+$ $2^2$S | n5 | 459 | 0.5148 9299 62 | 0.2651 148 | 2.000009 | -13.9227 8162 47 | | 7.6 |
| Be$^+$ $2^2$S | n6 | 535 | 0.5149 3042 17 | 0.2651 533 | 2.000008 | -13.9227 8531 43 | -13.9227 8926 85 | 3.9 |
| Be$^+$ $3^2$S | n4 | 252 | 0.0752 1442 67 | 0.0056 572 | 2.001593 | -13.7985 2045 32 | | |
| Be$^+$ $3^2$S | n5 | 372 | 0.0742 1482 48 | 0.0055 078 | 2.000484 | -13.7987 0472 20 | | 16.3 |
| Be$^+$ $3^2$S | n6 | 451 | 0.0738 5606 29 | 0.0054 547 | 2.000154 | -13.7987 0889 23 | -13.7987 1657 | 7.7 |
| Be$^+$ $4^2$S | n5 | 502 | 0.0398 3939 53 | 0.0015 871 | 2.004399 | -13.7347 3172 02 | | |
| Be$^+$ $4^2$S | n6 | 516 | 0.0397 6930 41 | 0.0015 816 | 2.004126 | -13.7424 8645 38 | -13.7446 306 | 3106.7 |
| Be$^+$ $5^2$S | n6 | 603 | 0.0256 1557 46 | 0.000 6562 | 2.003919 | -13.7152 8280 61 | -13.7162 8624 | 1003.4 |

[a] Basis set, i.e. $n4$ stays for $[4s3p2d1f]$ or $[1s2s3s4s2p3p4p3d4d4f]$.
[b] N is the number of Hy-CI symmetry adapted configurations.
[c] Details on the calculations and comparison with reference energies are given in Ref. [14].

TABLE II: Transition probabilities for the nuclear $\beta^-$-decay from the ground $1^2S$-state of the Li atom into the ground and various excited states of the Be$^+$ ion. The probability of ionization from Be$^+$ ion to Be$^{2+}$ ion is calculated as $P_{ion} = 1 - \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} P_i$.

| State of Be$^+$ | Amplitude | Probability ($P_i$) | $P_i$ in % |
|---|---|---|---|
| $1^2$S | 0.7596 8900 66 | 0.5771 273 | 57.71 |
| $2^2$S | 0.5149 3042 17 | 0.2651 533 | 26.51 |
| $3^2$S | 0.0738 5606 29 | 0.0054 547 | 0.54 |
| $4^2$S | 0.0398 3939 53 | 0.0015 871 | 0.15 |
| $5^2$S | 0.0256 1557 46 | 0.0006 562 | 0.06 |
| Total | | 0.8499 708 | 84.99 |
| $P_{ion}$ | | 0.1500 292 | 15.00 |

TABLE III: Transition probabilities for the nuclear $\beta^-$ decay from the excited $2^2S$-, $3^2S$-, $4^2S$-, $5^2S$-states of the Li atom[a] into the ground and various excited states of the Be$^+$ ion.

| States Li → Be$^+$ | Amplitude | Probability | $P_i$ in % |
|---|---|---|---|
| $2^2$S → $1^2$S | 0.2399 9904 24 | 0.0575 995 | 5.76 |
| $2^2$S → $2^2$S | 0.4662 0000 32 | 0.2173 424 | 21.73 |
| $2^2$S → $3^2$S | 0.7575 2492 75 | 0.5738 440 | 57.38 |
| $2^2$S → $4^2$S | 0.0165 6566 49 | 0.0002 744 | 0.03 |
| $2^2$S → $5^2$S | 0.0132 6988 87 | 0.0001 761 | 0.02 |
| Total | | 0.8492 364 | 84.20 |
| $P_{ion}$ | | 0.1507 636 | 15.08 |
| $3^2$S → $1^2$S | 0.1322 9548 78 | 0.0175 021 | 1.75 |
| $3^2$S → $2^2$S | 0.2354 2179 57 | 0.0554 234 | 5.54 |
| $3^2$S → $3^2$S | 0.1207 0198 23 | 0.0145 690 | 1.46 |
| $3^2$S → $4^2$S | 0.8274 1166 41 | 0.6846 101 | 68.46 |
| $3^2$S → $5^2$S | 0.2409 8079 97 | 0.0580 717 | 5.81 |
| Total | | 0.8301 763 | 83.02 |
| $P_{ion}$ | | 0.1698 237 | 16.98 |
| $4^2$S → $1^2$S | 0.1024 2628 65 | 0.0104 911 | 1.05 |
| $4^2$S → $2^2$S | 0.1700 6598 04 | 0.0289 224 | 2.89 |
| $4^2$S → $3^2$S | 0.1068 2286 82 | 0.0114 111 | 1.14 |
| $4^2$S → $4^2$S | 0.2356 9455 04 | 0.0313 772 | 3.14 |
| $4^2$S → $5^2$S | 0.0132 6988 87 | 0.0001 761 | 0.02 |
| Total | | 0.0823 779 | 22.52 |
| $P_{ion}$ | | 0.9176 221 | 91.76 |
| $5^2$S → $1^2$S | 0.1304 3306 40 | 0.0170 127 | 1.70 |
| $5^2$S → $2^2$S | 0.2194 2766 22 | 0.0481 485 | 4.81 |
| $5^2$S → $3^2$S | 0.1985 1409 22 | 0.0394 078 | 3.94 |
| $5^2$S → $4^2$S | 0.0788 4729 63 | 0.0006 217 | 0.06 |
| $5^2$S → $5^2$S | 0.3681 2183 36 | 0.1355 137 | 13.55 |
| Total | | 0.2407 044 | 24.07 |
| $P_{ion}$ | | 0.7592 956 | 75.93 |

[a] The calculated energy of the first excited S-state of lithium atom $2^2S$ is -7.3540 9081 85 a.u. and of the higher excited states $3^2S$ -7.3184 8295 19 a.u., $4^2S$ -7.3018 6513 00 a.u. an $5^2S$ -7.2859 3924 50 a.u.

[b] The calculated energies of the S-states of Be$^+$ are the best values of Table I.

TABLE IV: Transition probabilities between states of P-symmetry for the nuclear $\beta^-$-decay of the Li[a] atom to the Be$^+$ ion[b].

| States Li → Be$^+$ | Amplitude | Probability | $P_i$ in % |
|---|---|---|---|
| $1^2$P → $1^2$P | 0.6943 3672 59 | 0.4821 035 | 48.21 |
| $1^2$P → $2^2$P | 0.6833 4887 87 | 0.4669 657 | 46.70 |
| $1^2$P → $3^2$P | 0.0105 6023 91 | 0.0001 115 | 0.01 |
| $1^2$P → $4^2$P | 0.0393 4260 79 | 0.0015 478 | 0.15 |
| $1^2$P → $5^2$P | 0.0116 1081 46 | 0.0001 348 | 0.01 |
| Total | | 0.9508 633 | 95.09 |
| $P_{ion}$ | | 0.0491 367 | 4.91 |
| $2^2$P → $1^2$P | 0.2744 5538 05 | 0.0753 258 | 7.53 |
| $2^2$P → $2^2$P | 0.2820 1654 80 | 0.0795 333 | 7.95 |
| $2^2$P → $3^2$P | 0.7926 0524 74 | 0.6282 231 | 62.82 |
| $2^2$P → $4^2$P | 0.1664 2355 98 | 0.0276 968 | 2.77 |
| $2^2$P → $5^2$P | 0.0044 8810 06 | 0.0000 201 | 0.00 |
| Total | | 0.8107 991 | 81.08 |
| $P_{ion}$ | | 0.1892009 | 18.92 |
| $3^2$P → $1^2$P | 0.1602 9051 12 | 0.0256 930 | 2.57 |
| $3^2$P → $2^2$P | 0.1587 5209 09 | 0.0252 022 | 2.52 |
| $3^2$P → $3^2$P | 0.0646 4956 75 | 0.0004 180 | 0.04 |
| $3^2$P → $4^2$P | 0.1782 7236 64 | 0.0317 810 | 3.18 |
| $3^2$P → $5^2$P | 0.4245 0682 17 | 0.1802 060 | 18.02 |
| Total | | 0.2633 002 | 26.33 |
| $P_{ion}$ | | 0.7366 998 | 73.67 |
| $4^2$P → $1^2$P | 0.1013 4091 61 | 0.0102 700 | 1.03 |
| $4^2$P → $2^2$P | 0.1007 7182 29 | 0.0101 550 | 1.02 |
| $4^2$P → $3^2$P | 0.1446 2244 15 | 0.0209 157 | 2.09 |
| $4^2$P → $4^2$P | 0.0073 1346 56 | 0.0000 535 | 0.00 |
| $4^2$P → $5^2$P | 0.1265 8442 00 | 0.0160 236 | 1.60 |
| Total | | 0.0574 178 | 5.74 |
| $P_{ion}$ | | 0.9425 822 | 94.26 |
| $5^2$P → $1^2$P | 0.0810 5021 14 | 0.0065 691 | 0.66 |
| $5^2$P → $2^2$P | 0.0797 1490 95 | 0.0006 354 | 0.06 |
| $5^2$P → $3^2$P | 0.0278 0955 64 | 0.0007 734 | 2.98 |
| $5^2$P → $4^2$P | 0.1425 1492 45 | 0.0203 105 | 2.03 |
| $5^2$P → $5^2$P | 0.3507 2668 43 | 0.1230 092 | 12.30 |
| Total | | 0.1605 397 | 16.05 |
| $P_{ion}$ | | 0.8394 603 | 83.94 |

[a] The energies of the incident P-states of Li atom are: $1^2P$ -7.4101 3402 79 a.u., $2^2P$ -7.3370 5244 47 a.u., $3^2P$ -7.3117 1131 29 a.u., $4^2P$ -7.2996 7937 20 a.u. and $5^2P$ -7.2939 6712 18 a.u. For more details of the calculations of S, P, D-states see Ref. [14].

TABLE V: Transition probabilities between states of D-symmetry for the nuclear $\beta^-$-decay of the Li atom[a] to the Be$^+$ ion[b].

| States Li → Be$^+$ | Amplitude | Probability | $P_i$ in % |
|---|---|---|---|
| $1^2$D → $1^2$D | 0.6142 8174 56 | 0.3773 421 | 37.73 |
| $1^2$D → $2^2$D | 0.6684 9584 40 | 0.4468 867 | 44.69 |
| $1^2$D → $3^2$D | 0.1470 1259 45 | 0.0216 127 | 2.16 |
| $1^2$D → $4^2$D | 0.1666 2545 25 | 0.0277 640 | 2.77 |
| $1^2$D → $5^2$D | 0.0801 1513 53 | 0.0064 184 | 0.64 |
| Total | | 0.8800 239 | 88.00 |
| $P_{ion}$ | | 0.1199 761 | 12.00 |
| $2^2$D → $1^2$D | 0.3211 3958 42 | 0.3209 154 | 32.09 |
| $2^2$D → $2^2$D | 0.0738 9620 29 | 0.0054 606 | 0.55 |
| $2^2$D → $3^2$D | 0.1751 7333 89 | 0.0306 857 | 3.07 |
| $2^2$D → $4^2$D | 0.0085 5473 79 | 0.0000 732 | 0.00 |
| $2^2$D → $5^2$D | 0.1192 6222 20 | 0.0142 235 | 1.42 |
| Total | | 0.3713 584 | 37.14 |
| $P_{ion}$ | | 0.6286 416 | 62.86 |
| $3^2$D → $1^2$D | 0.4996 1439 98 | 0.2496 145 | 24.96 |
| $3^2$D → $2^2$D | 0.5266 3216 24 | 0.2773 414 | 27.73 |
| $3^2$D → $3^2$D | 0.1994 4115 14 | 0.0397 768 | 3.98 |
| $3^2$D → $4^2$D | 0.1442 8272 30 | 0.0208 175 | 2.08 |
| $3^2$D → $5^2$D | 0.1192 6222 20 | 0.0142 235 | 1.42 |
| Total | | 0.6017 737 | 60.18 |
| $P_{ion}$ | | 0.3982 263 | 39.82 |
| $4^2$D → $1^2$D | 0.0742 7513 33 | 0.0055 168 | 0.55 |
| $4^2$D → $2^2$D | 0.1217 8600 46 | 0.0148 318 | 1.48 |
| $4^2$D → $3^2$D | 0.5611 2979 31 | 0.3148 666 | 31.49 |
| $4^2$D → $4^2$D | 0.2051 1260 05 | 0.0420 712 | 4.21 |
| $4^2$D → $5^2$D | 0.0562 9905 16 | 0.0031 696 | 0.32 |
| Total | | 0.3804 560 | 38.05 |
| $P_{ion}$ | | 0.6195 44 | 61.95 |
| $5^2$D → $1^2$D | 0.0760 3320 23 | 0.0058 266 | 0.58 |
| $5^2$D → $2^2$D | 0.0710 4274 30 | 0.0050 471 | 0.50 |
| $5^2$D → $3^2$D | 0.5839 9688 81 | 0.3410 524 | 34.10 |
| $5^2$D → $4^2$D | 0.2109 1540 90 | 0.0444 853 | 4.45 |
| $5^2$D → $5^2$D | 0.1205 7441 46 | 0.0145 382 | 1.45 |
| Total | | 0.4109 496 | 41.09 |
| $P_{ion}$ | | 0.5890 504 | 58.90 |

[a] The energies of the incident D-states of Li atoms are: $1^2D$ -7.3355 0164 04 a.u, $2^2D$ -7.3111 6142 89 a.u., $3^2D$ -7.2331 8155 48 a.u., $4^2D$ -6.5887 9667 72 a.u. and $5^2D$ -6.6010 1966 62 a.u.

[b] The energies of the final states of the Be$^+$ ion are: $1^2D$ -13.8780 0469 69 a.u. $2^2D$ -13.7793 2881 02 a.u.,

TABLE VI: Study of the accuracy of the wave functions and precision of the calculations for the determination of the $\beta$-decay transition probabilities Li atom ⟶ Be$^+$ ion. Convergency of the CI calculations with respect to the basis. Comparison with Hy-CI calculations. Energy in a.u.

| State | Basis | N | Amplitude | Probability | Virial | Energy (CI) | Ref. Ener.[a] | Diff[b] | Diff[c] in % |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| $1^2$S Li | n4 | 406 | | | 2.00004 | -7.4748 3857 | | 3222 | |
| $1^2$S Li | n5 | 690 | | | 2.00000 | -7.4763 0444 | | 1756 | |
| $1^2$S Li | n6 | 1388 | | | 2.00000 | -7.4769 2455 | | 1136 | |
| $1^2$S Li | n7 | 2361 | | | 1.99999 | -7.4771 9160 | -7.4780 6032 39 | 869 | |
| $1^2$S Be$^+$ | n4 | 406 | 0.73860 | 0.54553 | 1.99999 | -14.3190 6528 | | 5698 | -3.16 |
| $1^2$S Be$^+$ | n5 | 690 | 0.77531 | 0.60110 | 1.99999 | -14.3227 7416 | | 1989 | 2.40 |
| $1^2$S Be$^+$ | n6 | 1388 | 0.72297 | 0.52269 | 1.99999 | -14.3234 6780 | | 1295 | -5.44 |
| $1^2$S Be$^+$ | n7 | 2361 | 0.77092 | 0.59432 | 1.99999 | -14.3237 6855 | -14.3247 6317 68 | 995 | 1.72 |
| $2^2$S Be$^+$ | n4 | 406 | 0.51835 | 0.26869 | 2.00060 | -13.9190 5228 | | 3737 | 0.35 |
| $2^2$S Be$^+$ | n5 | 690 | 0.52015 | 0.27056 | 2.00011 | -13.9207 7083 | | 2018 | 0.55 |
| $2^2$S Be$^+$ | n6 | 1388 | 0.65454 | 0.42842 | 2.00003 | -13.9215 2875 | | 1261 | 16.33 |
| $2^2$S Be$^+$ | n7 | 2361 | 0.63282 | 0.40046 | 2.00002 | -13.9218 2982 | -13.9227 8926 85 | 959 | 13.54 |
| $3^2$S Be$^+$ | n4 | 406 | 0.08550 | 0.00731 | 2.00489 | -13.7950 2353 | | 3693 | 0.16 |
| $3^2$S Be$^+$ | n5 | 690 | 0.07722 | 0.00596 | 2.00216 | -13.7966 3281 | | 2084 | 0.02 |
| $3^2$S Be$^+$ | n6 | 1388 | 0.06246 | 0.00390 | 2.00042 | -13.7974 4352 | | 1273 | -0.16 |
| $3^2$S Be$^+$ | n7 | 2361 | 0.13474 | 0.01815 | 2.00009 | -13.7977 5382 | -13.7987 1657 | 963 | 1.25 |

[a] Comparison of energy results are detailed in Ref. [14]

[b] Difference energy between CI and reference energy in millihartrees.

[c] Difference between the transition probabilities calculated by Hy-CI and CI methods in %.